



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

REVISED

February 5, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman

SUBJECT: Approval of Accountability Workbook Amendments for 2006-07

At the January 2007 State Board of Education meeting, six Accountability Workbook amendments were described and discussed. The proposed amendments are presented in full detail in the attachment to this memorandum. The amendments must be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) by February 15, 2007.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the Accountability Workbook Amendments for 2006-07 as presented in the revised document attached to the memorandum dated February 5, 2007.

Attachment

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Accountability Workbook Amendments

1. New school definition – USDE has asked all states to specify in their workbooks how they define a new school for the purpose of allowing a school to return to phase zero for adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Section 1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and Local Education Association (LEA) in the State?

When a new school, such as a charter school, opens for the first time, the school is considered to be in the first year of the accountability system. Since a school needs two years of data to begin the accountability process, the school is given a provisional AYP status the first year. When a school reaches advanced stages of identification for improvement, a school may be restructured in response to school improvement efforts. This raises the question about when a school becomes a new school. Below is the definition for a school becoming a new school and starting at phase zero in the accountability process:

A public school is defined as “NEW” by the following criteria as determined by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE):

- A. Assessment scores cannot validly be compared when a school’s student population changes by 50% or more (not counting fluctuations that occur as a result of the size of feeder school grades moving in). Therefore, a school will be considered “new” when district decisions cause 50% or more of the student composition to change within a one year period.
OR...
- B. When the legal governing entity to which the school is accountable turns over its responsibility and authority to a new legal governing entity AND when at least one of the following factors changes substantively: staffing or facilities.
 - 1. Staffing: Substantively changed staffing occurs when all the administrator(s) change and more than 50% of the certified teachers change.
 - 2. Facilities: Substantively changed facilities occur when the building or set of physical resources is changed in a way that substantively affects the educational program.

2. Graduation cohorts more than four years – With the recognition that time is the variable for some students to achieve the more rigorous graduation requirements recently legislated in Michigan, we are specifying the circumstances under which MDE will consider the “standard number of years for graduation” to be more than four years.

Section 7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?

Michigan has agreed to use the method outlined by the National Governors Association to develop a cohort based methodology for graduation and dropout rates. Michigan's plan is to use the traditional methodology (approved and described in a previous Accountability Workbook) to report the rates one last time for the class of 2006. These rates will be used for AYP determinations for the 2006-07 school year. Michigan will implement the cohort method for the class of 2007, to be used for AYP determinations for 2007-08.

Michigan will calculate and report a standard, four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate to be used for AYP determinations, beginning in 2007-08. The cohort graduation rate will be calculated by dividing the number of on-time graduates in a given year by the number of first-time entering ninth graders four years earlier. Graduates are those receiving a high school diploma. The denominator will be adjusted for transfers in and out of the system. Michigan's student data system tracks individual students with a longitudinal student unit record data system.

Students enrolled in a middle college high school or other recognized instructional program that provides for five years to acquire both a high school diploma and an associate degree or other career or technical certificate will be placed in a five-year cohort. Five years will be considered the "standard number of years" for on-time graduation for these students.

Recently passed legislation in Michigan specifies the minimum required credits for high school graduation. The requirements of the Michigan Merit Standard are rigorous and the state statute includes a provision to create a personal curriculum modification that could result in a student taking extra time to meet the credit requirements. For most students, the "standard number of years" for graduation will be four years or less, and the cohort formula described above will be used. But, on a case by case basis, students in some groups may be assigned to a graduation cohort in the year in which they attain the age of 16. Students in this cohort may be:

- Students with Disabilities;
- English Language Learners;
- Students that have been unable to attend school full time or for a full year due to health problems or mandatory expulsion; and
- Students in Migratory Status.

To encourage schools to serve students who remain in school beyond four years, a separate graduation rate is calculated that includes students who graduate in more than four years, and this rate may be used for AYP purposes for students in recognized alternative education schools and programs.

High schools that do not have the ability to have graduates (e.g., schools serving only grades 9-10 or special education centers that offer only a certificate of completion) will use their school-wide annual dropout rate as the additional academic indicator.

3. Seeking approval to use best score through grade 12 in AYP calculation for high school students that re-take the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).

Section 2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?

Michigan is changing its high school assessment, beginning in the spring of 2007, from the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) High School Test to the MME. Michigan has submitted the MME for federal peer review as part of its standards and assessment system and has received tentative approval.

Michigan's high school assessments have been regularly scheduled for administration during the spring to students enrolled in the eleventh grade. Michigan allows students to retest during the senior year to qualify for a state funded college scholarship. Students have only one opportunity to retest during the senior year.

Michigan sought federal approval to use senior retests in the determination of AYP, in its initial Accountability Workbook in 2003. Michigan's 2003 proposal was denied because federal rules in effect in 2003 did not allow states to use data from assessment administrations after the initial administration for AYP purposes. The USDE published proposed rules in 2006 that provide flexibility on this issue. Michigan again seeks to use senior retest data in making AYP determinations. Michigan proposes to begin incorporating students' best score, including senior retests, in AYP determinations beginning with the class of 2008, which is the first group of students that will take the MME.

4. Identification of school or school district for improvement – We are seeking approval to identify a school or school district for improvement only if the school or school district does not make AYP for the same content area in the same subgroup for two consecutive years.

Section 3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?

Michigan will identify for improvement any school or school district where the school does not make AYP for the same content area in the same subgroup for two consecutive years. A school will be advanced in phase each succeeding school year that the school or school district does not make AYP for that content area in the same subgroup. A school or school district will be identified for improvement until the school or school district makes AYP for two consecutive years for that content area in the same subgroup.

5. Request continuation of proxy calculation for students with mild to moderate cognitive impairment up to 2% since final regulations have not yet been published.

Section 5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of AYP?

Michigan will plan to use the Option 1 (proxy) calculation again for the 2006-07 testing cycle to determine the percent proficient and adjusted AYP decision for schools that fail to make AYP solely due to the students with disabilities subgroup. We will develop a timeline for the alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards after the final regulations on that type of assessment are released.

6. Formerly Limited English Proficient (FLEP) Students and AYP – Allow schools and school districts to include FLEP students in the (LEP) subgroup for AYP calculation for up to two years. Allow schools and school districts to expand flexibility for English language learners (ELL) in their first year of school in the U.S. to their first two years of school in the U.S.

Section 5.4 How are students with LEP included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?

On September 13, 2006, the USDE published federal rules which clarify the use of student achievement data on FLEP students in making AYP determinations for the LEP subgroup. The regulations clarify that state Accountability Plans may enable those schools and school districts that have measurable LEP subgroups to include the scores of former LEP students in AYP determinations for up to two years after the student exits the LEP subgroup. Using the authority of these regulations, Michigan will give school districts the option, based on their individual circumstances, of deciding whether to include the scores of former LEP students in the LEP subgroup for AYP determination. If a Michigan school district chooses to take advantage of this flexibility and includes the scores of former LEP students in determining and reporting AYP, the school district must include all such defined students.

Starting in 2006-07, Michigan proposes to provide school districts and public school academies the following flexibility for ELL enrolled in U.S. schools for their first or second year:

- Use results from English Language Proficiency assessment (ELPA) given to determine whether the ELL student should take the MEAP or MI Access English language arts (ELA) test. If taken, scores will be counted toward 95% participation for AYP, but test scores will not be counted into AYP results. If the MEAP or MI Access ELA test is not taken, participation in the English language proficiency testing program will count toward the 95% participation rate for AYP. Administer the MEAP or MI Access mathematics test. Scores will be counted toward 95% participation in AYP, but scores will not be counted into AYP results.

7. School Report Cards for all high schools and some schools testing students with the MI-Access Participation and Supported Independence assessments.

Section 1.4 How does the State provide accountability and AYP decisions and information in a timely manner?

In March 2007, Michigan will be administering for the first time a new high school assessment, the MME, as required by state statute. The assessment will require peer review and final approval before the state can use it for AYP reporting as required for the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The time it will take to do standard setting, develop the necessary technical reports, and obtain approval through the peer review process may result in the state agency being unable to issue school report cards for high schools before the beginning of the 2007-08 school year as required for NCLB accountability. Michigan will make every effort to issue the report cards in a timely manner but, for 2007 only, seeks permission for the delay, should it prove necessary.

Michigan is also using a new alternate assessment based on alternate standards for the students with the most significant cognitive impairments at all grade levels. This assessment will also be given in March. As with the MME high school assessment, the result of using a new assessment may cause a delay in issuing school report cards for any schools that assess students using this alternate assessment. As with the high school report cards, Michigan will make every effort to issue the report cards in a timely manner but, for 2007 only, seeks permission for the delay, should it prove necessary.

In the event that high school report cards and report cards for schools administering alternate assessments for severely cognitively impaired students are delayed beyond the start of the 2007-08 schools year, the MDE will issue preliminary school report cards to all schools based on results of the new assessments and will notify all schools that do not make AYP based on preliminary data that they must move ahead and implement consequences. For schools that are in school improvement status and make AYP based on preliminary data, those schools will continue in school improvement status until Michigan is notified of peer review results.